THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

15 March 2001

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 441 F Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes: 15 February 2001

B. Dates of next meetings: 19 April 2001
17 May 2001 (the Commission's 91st Anniversary)

C. Report on the CFA/HABS exhibition at Tudor Place.

D. Report on the 8 March 2001 hearing of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands of the House Committee on Resources on H.R. 452, a bill to authorize the establishment of a memorial to former President Ronald Reagan.

E. 21 March 2001 hearing of the House Government Reform Subcommittee on the District of Columbia on the reopening of Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. <u>National Park Service</u>

CFA 15/MAR/01- 1, Jefferson Memorial. Ohio Drive. Rehabilitation of the lighting. Design. (Previous: CFA 17/Jan/73).

II. SUBMISSION AND REVIEWS continued, 15 March 2001

B. General Services Administration

CFA 15/MAR/01- 2, Department of Education Building. 400 Block of Maryland Avenue, SW. Safety railings for vehicular ramps and landscape. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 18/JAN/01- 4).

C. Department of the Army

1. CFA 15/MAR/01- 3, Walter Reed Army Medical Center. Aspen Drive. Building 83. Renovation and addition. Concept.

2. CFA 15/MAR/01- 4, Fort Myer. Stables Building 233. Renovation. Final.

D. Department of the Treasury/ U.S. Mint

CFA 15/MAR/01- 5, Fifty states circulating/commemorative quarters. Designs for sixteenth through twentieth states: Tennessee, Ohio, Louisiana, Indiana, and Mississippi. (Previous: CFA 17/FEB/00- 6).

E. Department of Energy

CFA 15/MAR/01- 6, National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). New Logo. Design.

F. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 01-27, 3700 O Street, NW. Georgetown University. Ryan Administration Building. MBNA Performing Arts Center addition. Concept.

b. Appendix I.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 01-024, Massachusetts Avenue and H Street, NW (Sq. 529). Massachusetts Courts. New 14 story apartment building. Revised concept.

b. Appendix II.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 00-153 HPA. 00-378	3700 O Street, NW Georgetown University Southwest Quadrangle	Retaining wall and fence - permit

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case has been inactive for a period of time.

O.G. 01-03 HPA. 01-09	3330 N Street, NW Kathy Ryan Residence	Alterations and roof deck - permit

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case was withdrawn at the request of applicant. File new submission of drawings with concept application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-38 HPA. 01-75	2620 Dumbarton Street, NW Rebecca Klemm Residence	Fence, pergola and alterations to rear - conceptual

ACTION: Returned without Action. Proposed pergola, deck and alterations have been deleted from submission. File new submission of proposed replacement board fence with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-71 * HPA. 01-152	3265 S Street, NW Jelleff Boys and Girls Club	Alterations to parking lot - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to parking lot, including new curb cut and exit driveway and reduction in width of existing entry driveway as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated March 2001. Supplemental drawings indicate introduction of additional landscaped beds within parking lot. Note: further alterations to the approved site plan as the result of final review of proposed grading and drainage plan should be sent to the Commission for review.

---

* See Addendum

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-72 HPA. 01-153	3040 O Street, NW Jennifer Gardner Residence	Partial porch enclosure and alterations to rear - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for proposed partial enclosure of rear second story porch PROVIDED that only one of the window openings is modified for a swing door. Alterations to the two existing windows and the removal of historic fabric is NOT approved. Supplemental drawings shown at the Old Georgetown Board meeting indicated the preservation of existing masonry openings for access to new enclosure. File new submission of working drawings, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-75 HPA. 01-157	3208 Volta Place, NW Sharon O'Reilly Residence	Projection of rear second floor balcony and alterations - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to rear including projection of second floor balcony and new sliding doors PROVIDED doors have full glass panels rather than the divisions shown by muntin grids. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 00-137). File new submission of detail drawings for proposed light fixtures with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-76 HPA. 01-159	2914 O Street, NW von Klandy and Whitmore Residence	Rear deck - permit

ACTION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and a site visit of 22 February 2001 indicate that proposed rear deck is not visible from public space. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-77 HPA. 01-167	1066 31st Street, NW R B Associates, Inc. Mixed-use	Rear addition and alterations - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for rear addition to and preservation work on historic house as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 5 March 2001 which indicate stepping down of brick party wall as low as possible towards rear of lot, and demarcation of patio wall from actual second floor construction. File new submission of working drawings, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-78 HPA. 01-172	3028 Cambridge Place, NW Tom Hill Residence	Wood fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed board fence which is a replacement of existing wood fence.

O.G. 01-79 HPA. 01-177	2821 Q Street, NW Robert & Kathleen Chartener Residence	One-story rear addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed one-story rear addition. Recommend retention of as much of existing historic fabric on rear wall as possible.

O.G. 01-80 HPA. 01-158	1337 27th Street, NW F. Bolton Residence	New window opening on rear - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new window opening on rear wall. New window will be custom made to match existing windows.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-81 HPA. 01-181	1652 Avon Place, NW David Korn Residence	Alterations to front and rear, replacement windows - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement windows on rear and for proposed alterations to front as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 2 March 2001 which indicate retention of second door and existing historic windows, and extension of planter wall. Shutters and new door surround have been deleted from this submission. This house, part of a row of "flat" houses, is the last one that retains its original condition. The historic character of the front facade should be preserved.

O.G. 01-82 HPA. 01-182	3265-3269 M Street, NW East Banc, Inc. Ann Taylor Loft	Sign and roof A/C screen fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed scheme for signs, including 9-inch high letters on transom over door at 3265 M and 12-inch high letters on sign panel at 3269 M, both reading: Ann Taylor Loft. Sign scheme includes three applied signs on shop windows. No additional signs are to be installed in shop windows.

O.G. 01-83 HPA. 01-183	3273 M Street, NW The Levy Group Retail	Alterations to storefront - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to storefront and for replacement windows on rear. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 00-190). File new submission for any signs, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-84 HPA. 01-184	3141 P Street, NW Jack and Noel Evans Residence	Rear addition at 2nd floor and roof deck - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed rear addition at 2nd floor and roof deck as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated March 2001 which indicate removal of new window openings on historic party wall which were not approved. Historic brick wall is NOT to be painted. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 00-232).

O.G. 01-85 HPA. 01-185	3100 South Street, NW Millennium Georgetown Partners Georgetown Incinerator Brickyard Hill Houses	Move houses back on Incinerator site - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for moving of historic Brickyard Hill Houses and two other structures which were previously removed from the Georgetown Incinerator site and stored across the street. Houses will be repaired and relocated as shown in approved site plan. See previous Action (O.G. 00-49).

O.G. 01-86 HPA. 01-186	3077 M Street, NW East Banc, Inc. Pottery Barn/Smith & Hawken	Gate at walkway - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new gates along rear pedestrian alley providing access to residential units.

O.G. 01-87 HPA. 01-187	1251 Bank Street, NW East Banc, Inc. Apartment building	Gate at entry vestibule - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed gate at entry vestibule for apartment building.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-88 HPA. 01-188	1304 30th Street, NW Nancy Ely-Raphel Residence	Replacement windows and alterations to rear - permit

ACTION: Returned without Action in relation to proposed alterations to rear. Submitted materials and site visit of 22 February 2001 indicate that proposed alterations are not visible from public space. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board. No objection to issuance of permit for repair of historic windows in front facade, including replacement wood sash to match existing ONLY when repair is not feasible.

O.G. 01-89 HPA. 01-189	1065 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Ltd. Part. of 1065 Wisconsin Ave. Houston's	Remove paint from brick facade - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed removal of paint on brick facade of Houston's. Recommend extreme caution and close following of manufacturer's instructions in the use of the proposed paint removal products. Brick wall will be re-painted if process exposes a less than desirable condition.

O.G. 01-90 HPA. 01-190	3100 South Street, NW Millennium Georgetown Partners Georgetown Incinerator The Ritz Carlton	Addition of one residential floor - revised design - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to revised concept design for the introduction of an additional floor to the residential component of the development at the Georgetown Incinerator site which had received final approval in June 2000 (See previous action O.G. 00-49). Recommend further study of setbacks to the upper level, and reduction of height particularly where the new construction frames the vista of the incinerator and its smokestack from the south. This recommendation is not to be construed as approval of the zoning variance required for this project, which is outside the purview of the Commission. File new submission of concept design development for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-93 HPA. 01-193	2712 Dumbarton Street, NW Archbishop Theodore McCarrick Epiphany Parish	Rear addition and connector - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for alterations and rear addition to the main sanctuary and adjacent rectory of the Epiphany Parish. File new submission of working drawings, including details, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-95 HPA. 01-195	3331 N Street, NW Alan Pollin Cox's Row residence	Demolish rear addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed demolition of one-story rear addition which is non-contributing to the historic character of this house, part of Cox's Row. No objection to removal of non-contributing steel exterior fire exit stairs on rear wall of historic house.

O.G. 01-98 HPA. 01-199	1317 35th Street, NW Victoria and Douglas Rixey Residence	New garage off private alley - permit

ACTION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials and site visit of 12 March 2001 indicate that proposed garage off private alley is not visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G. 01-100 HPA. 01-202	2814 R Street, NW Marion Goldberg Residence	Replacement roof - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement of asbestos roof shingles with CertainTeed fiberglass roof shingles PROVIDED shingle color is two-toned black rather than the proposed monochrome black.

ADDENDUM

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-71 HPA. 01-152	3265 S Street, NW Jelleff Boys and Girls Club	Alterations to parking lot - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to parking lot, including new curb cut and exit driveway and reduction in width of existing entry driveway as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 14 June 2001. Supplemental drawings indicate introduction of additional landscaped beds within parking lot. Note: further alterations to the approved site plan as the result of final review of proposed grading and drainage plan should be sent to the Commission for review.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 01-029	3060 Birch Street, NW Williams/Depaola Residence	Second story addition and renovation - Permit.

ACTION: Returned without Action. Property is outside the Shipstead-Luce Act Jurisdiction of the Commission of Fine Arts. (Returned to Permit Processing Division, 9 March 2001.)

S.L. 01-030	6101 16th Street, NW Rittenhouse, LLC Rittenhouse Apartments	Replacement windows - Permit.

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for replacement windows provided configuration of original window pattern is maintained and that the replacement frame is silver in color as shown in materials received and dated 2 March 2001 and in supplemental drawings received and dated 7 March 2001.

S.L. 01-022	500 5th Street, NW National Research Council	Revised north elevation - Revision to Permit.

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for revised north elevation on new eleven-story office building as shown in drawings received and dated 9 March 2001. Additional sculptural elements will require new submission of working drawings, including details, with separate permit application for review by the Commission when ready. (Previous: S.L.00-058, 19 April 2000).

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

15 March 2001

The meeting was convened at 10:25 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices in the National Building Museum, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. In the absence of both the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, due to illness, the meeting was chaired by Ms. Malino.

Members present:	Hon. Carolyn Brody
	Hon. Ann Todd Free
	Hon. Emily Malino
	Hon. Eden Rafshoon
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
	Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson, Assistant Secretary
	Ms. Sue Kohler
	Mr. Frederick J. Lindstrom
	Mr. José Martínez-Canino
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. David Hamilton

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes of the 15 February meeting. The minutes were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as:

19 April 2001
17 May 2001 (The Commission's 91st anniversary)

C. Report on the CFA/HABS exhibition at Tudor Place. The Secretary announced that there would be an exhibition at Tudor Place in April of drawings and photographs of the twenty-five houses to be documented in the Commission's forthcoming book on Georgetown architecture. He hoped the exhibition would stimulate interest in the book and get it back on track in the near future, and he noted there would be a reception on the 11th, to which the members were invited.

D. Report on the 8 March hearing of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands of the House Committee on Resources on H.R. 452, a bill to authorize the establishment of a memorial to former President Ronald Reagan. The Secretary reported the Commission's testimony, by Mrs. Brody, at this hearing, and asked Mrs. Brody to comment.

Mrs. Brody recalled that the bill had been submitted by Congressman Hansen; she said it would provide for a Ronald Reagan Memorial Commission which, within a period of two years, would approve the site and design of a memorial honoring the former president in Area 1, on the Mall. She said her testimony had expressed the Commission's concern with the bill for a number of reasons, particularly because it would violate the Commemorative Works Act in three ways: The Commission of Fine Arts and the Planning Commission would be removed from the process of site and design selection; the waiting period of twenty-five years after the death of the person honored would be ignored; and the two-step legislative process for erecting a memorial in Area 1 would be disregarded. She said similar concerns were expressed by others, and she noted also that it was stated at the beginning of the hearing that the administration opposed the bill, pointing out that Mr. Reagan himself had signed the Commemorative Works Act.

The Secretary said that, technically, the Commission's action was the same as that of the other agencies involved–to request that action be deferred, the object being to try to integrate the Commemorative Works Act into the proposed legislation. But he agreed with Mrs. Brody that everyone felt that it would not be appropriate to honor the President by essentially overturning a law he had signed.

E. 23 March hearing of the House Government Reform Subcommittee on the District of Columbia on the reopening of Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House. The Secretary reported that the Commission had been asked to testify on this issue, as had the Planning Commission, the Secret Service, the Federal City Council, and perhaps others; he recalled that the latter organization had commissioned an architect to do a study of the situation last year.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service

1. CFA 15/MAR/01-1, Jefferson Memorial, Ohio Drive. Rehabilitation of lighting. Design. (Previous: CFA 17/JAN/73) The Secretary noted for the record that members of the Commission had looked at a mock-up of the proposed new lighting at the Memorial the previous evening and then introduced John Parsons from the Park Service to begin the presentation.

Mr. Parsons said this would be the first relighting sinee 1973, and it would be done in partnership with OSRAM Sylvania, who would be doing it at no cost; he introduced Dwight Kitchen from Sylvania as their representative. Mr. Parsons said the new lighting would improve safety, in that it would light the steps, which had never been lit before, and it would change the color of the light to be more compatible with the Washington Monument and the Capitol dome. He introdueed David Mintz from the Mintz Lighting Group who gave the members some information about his firm and its Washington work. He asked his assoeiate, Ken Douglas, to make the teehnieal presentation.

Mr. Douglas began with the interior, saying that basieally they would refurbish existing lighting and add new lighting for the statue, text walls, and dome; old fixtures would be replaced with smaller and more energy-effieient ones. Mr. Douglas said fewer fixtures would be needed than before and no new holes would be eut in the structure. He noted that the dome, which had not been lit before, would have a low-level wash of light provided by up-lights to bring out the arehiteetural detail; the text band on the friezc bclow the dome would have just a soft glow , enough to make the text readable; the tcxt areas on the walls would also have a low-level wash of light.

Mr. Douglas then turned to the exterior. He said the entire front faeade would be lit, including the steps, to provide a higher level of safety and to give thc monument a visual base when viewed from aeross the Tidal Basin. The eurrent light pole locations would be abandoned and new poles placed inboard of the line of cherry trees, so that the building, rather than the trees, would be lit. In answer to a question from Mrs. Brody, he said the large pine trees elose to the building would be lit, but he thought that was a plus beeause they provided a nice contrast and some interesting shadows. He asked the members if they had any other questions.

Aeting Chairman Malino and Mrs. Brody both eommented on the lack of light along the exterior walks at the baek of the memorial and in the parking area. Mr. Douglas said they had not been asked to address that, and Mr. Parsons said he would look into it. Mrs. Brody said she thought the eonsensus during the demonstration was that the interior lighting was headed in the right direction, espeeially after the light on the text walls was softened and dimmed, but the exterior was too brightly and too harshly lit; Ms. Malino agreed. There was a discussion about what the next stcp should be, especially since the metal halide lights were not dimmable, and the next step down from the 400 watt metal halide lamps used was a 250 watt lamp. Mr. Douglas said they strongly recommended using the 400 watt lamps beeause the light level would diminish with the aging of the equipment and the lamps; he thought the 250 watt lamps would end up being too dim. He said they would do another demonstration using the 250 watt lamps if the Commission requested it, although he said, when asked, that it would require a considerable amount of effort, sinee the ballast for each fixture would have to be changed as well as the lamps. There were othcr questions, some concerning eolor ehanges as the lamps aged. Mr. Douglas and Mr. Mintz were also asked if there would be a color ehange if the lower wattage lamps werc used. The answer was that the light would continue to be white, but dimmer and less stark.

The last area of concern, and pcrhaps the most important, was what effect the brighter lighting would have on the more dimly lit Washington Monument, and to a lesser extent because of distance, on the Lineoln Memorial and the Capitol. It was agreed by all that the Jefferson Memorial could not be more brightly lit than the Washington Monument. The Aeting Chairman strongly urged that no final action be taken at this time, and that more research be done on the kind and level of light used for the major

monuments. Staff member Frederick Lindstrom suggested that a study of the relative refleeted lumens would be helpful. He said the Commission had taken a tour in 1973 to look at the lighting of the monuments and other important buildings, and perhaps it could be repeated; Mr. Parsons thought that would be a good idea. He asked once more about the interior lighting and was told that it was difficult to give unconditional approval, because the exterior lighting penetrated the interior and the effect might change if exterior changes were made. Mr. Douglas recalled that he had said during the demonstration that repositioning the light poles would eliminate the problems that had been observed.

The Acting Chairman asked for a motion. Mrs. Brody moved that the illumination of the Jefferson Memorial be considered in relation to that of the other monuments and particularly the Washington Monument, and that the issues raised in terms of the intensity of the illumination be considered and another demonstration arranged with an effort to show what the ultimate effect would be. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Exhibit A

B. Department of Education Building, 400 block of Maryland Avenue, S.W. Safety railings for vehicular ramps and landscape. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 18/JAN/01-4) Staff member Frederick Lindstrom recalled the previous submission, which resulted in approval of the railings but disapproval of the adjacent plantings, with request for further study and retention of the yew hedge. He introduced Gary Porter from GSA to discuss the outcome.

Mr. Porter said first that they were working on a redesign of the entire plaza, which would be submitted later; in the meantime they had installed interim plantings of inkberry, dwarf nandina, and liriope on the east, west, and north sides to meet the public health and safety issues raised by the yew hedge. For the plantings adjacent to the railings on the south side, they now had three alternate interim schemes that would solve the public health issues raised by the rat problem and at the same time replicate the architectural character of the yew hedge. Before continuing with a discussion of the plant selection, he asked Dr. Albert Green, head of GSA's Pest Control Division, to talk about the public health problems associated with the yew hedge. Dr. Green said the yew was now considered an inappropriate selection for urban planting because of the fact that rats were extremely attracted to it. He said the rat situation was such that it could not be managed by pesticides or traps, but needed a cultural, structural, and procedural approach that would prevent the problem in the first place. He noted that a recent study in Boston had determined that yew and recumbent juniper were the worst things to plant in an urban setting because their dense structure provided an ideal habitat for rodents. Therefore, other plants that would provide a similar architectural effect were being investigated, primarily more columnar, open types. Dr. Green described a situation opposite the diplomatic entrance to the State Department, where an old holly hedge, invested with rats, had been removed and the rat population dropped to zero.

Mr. Porter asked horticulturist Janet Kanoyer to discuss the three alternate proposals for interim planting, while the plaza was being redesigned. One consisted entirely of lirope; the second used a fairly close planting of the taller inkberry with lirope below; and the third would place columnar arborvitae in front of each building column, with lirope filling the rest of the planting bed. There was a discussion of all three schemes, with the suggestion that mondo grass replace lirope, no matter which scheme was selected, because it would not turn brown during the winter. In the end there was

unanimous agreement that the arborvitae in front of each column with a mondo grass undercover would be the most sympathetic architectural solution. Exhibit B

C. Department of the Army

1. Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Aspen Drive. Building 83. Renovation and addition. Concept. Staff member José Martínez showed aerial photographs of a section of the campus, recalling that the Commission had recently reviewed and approved additions to Building 91, next to Building 83, the current submission. The proposal was to renovate and add onto Building 83 and use it as a computer center, as the present center was being demolished to allow for the recreation of a formal garden previously on the site. He introduced Marjorie Marcus from Walter Reed and Ed Awni, the acting deputy director, and asked Ms. Marcus to begin the presentation.

Ms. Marcus described both buildings 83 and 91 as being utilitarian, with nothing in common stylistically; the plan was to tie them together by the style of their additions and a landscaped courtyard between them. She showed the approved plans for Building 91, a 1950s building, which were in a modern style, in dark brick. The additions to Building 83, a red brick structure built in 1942 as an animal house, and in a style different from that of Building 91, were in a similar style and color. The additions would house the main computer space as well as provide entrance and lobby functions at both north and south ends. Ms. Marcus commented on the windowless facade of the computer room, the largest of the additions, saying that it had been done for security reasons. There were misgivings on the part of the Commission members about the heavy, dreary quality of the computer room and the use of dark brown brick next to the more traditional red brick of the original structure, as well as the architectural style, which had blended well with the architecture of Building 91 but was not compatible with that of Building 83. Mrs. Brody asked what the staff thought. Mr. Martínez said the staff opinion was the same–that the modern architectural style was not right for this building with its gables and dormers, that the contrast was too great. Mr. Lindstrom added that the staff was in favor of the courtyard concept and thought the new entrances for Building 83 could be more compatible with the existing building and still have a relationship with the entrances to Building 93 and to the courtyard. As for the computer room addition, he thought it could perhaps be a separate structure, with a glass or other light connection to the old building. The stair tower and entrance would need some study, but he thought it could be improved. The Acting Chairman asked him if such changes would involve a total revision of the design, and he said he believed they would. She asked Mr. Awni about his schedule, and he replied that the design was already 90 percent complete. There was a discussion about ways in which the design could be improved and still meet the July-August date for awarding contracts. Further landscaping, especially on the side of the computer room addition not facing the courtyard, was one suggestion; more articulation of the computer room blank wall with some variation in the brick color was another. Ms. Malino commented that the review process had essentially been ignored, and although she realized that the design development stage had been nearly completed, she didn't think any of the Commission members really liked the solution. She said she would like to have the Walter Reed architects work with the staff and then come back next month and let the Commission see what had been accomplished. Mrs. Free made a motion to that effect, and it was seconded by Mrs. Brody, who said she didn't know how this had happened, but it had not been fair to either party; a great deal of work had been done, and it was so objectionable that it had to be disapproved. The motion was carried unanimously. Exhibit C

2. CFA 15/MAR/01-4, Fort Myer, Arlington, Virginia. Stables Building 233. Renovation. Final. Mr. Lindstrom said this submission was for renovation of the historic stables building that would take it back more or less to its original configuration; ventilation problems would also be corrected. He said the staff was in full agreement with the proposals, and then introduced Myrtle Bowen and Greg Post from Fort Myer; he asked Ms. Bowen to make the presentation.

Ms. Bowen noted first that the building was erected in 1896. Referring to the Historic Report, she pointed out a window on the west facade next to the stable door which she said had been converted to a door; the door would be removed and replaced with a window like the one in shown in an old photograph. On the east facade , a large window with a sliding wood panel, used as an entrance to the hayloft, would be fitted with two, four-light windows. The Acting Chairman questioned the use of that window, and upon hearing that it would no longer be the entrance to the hayloft, suggested that it be reduced to its original size and configuration, as shown in the old photograph. She noted also that the photo showed an arched opening over the stable door, rather than the flat one now existing, and asked if the arch could be restored. Ms. Bowen thought both changes were feasible. The other members were in agreement with these requests, and the project was then unanimously approved with the recommendations made. Exhibit D

D. Department of the Treasury, United States Mint

CFA 15/MAR/01-5, Fifty states circulating/commemorative quarters. Designs for sixteenth through twentieth states: Tennessee, Ohio, Louisiana, Indiana, and Mississippi. (Previous: CFA 17/FEB/00-6). Staff member Sue Kohler announced that the Mint had withdrawn this submission at the last minute; the reason given was that they needed to make the changes the Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee had requested before showing the designs to the Commission. She said the staff had talked with the Mint about this several times, saying that the Commission would prefer to see all the designs in their original form and then be able to make a decision based on that. The Mint could, of course, point out to the members which ones the CCCAC had preferred and what changes they had suggested. However, the Mint had chosen not to accede to the staff's request, and Ms. Kohler said she hoped the Commission would see the designs at the next meeting.

The Secretary said a letter really should be sent to the Mint saying that it was fundamental to the review process that the designs be seen in their original form. He commented also on the growing concern within the numismatic community and press in regard to this problem. Mrs. Rafshoon made a motion that when the Mint submitted the changes to the designs, they should bring the original designs as well. Mrs. Free seconded the motion, and it was carried unanimously.

E. Department of Energy

CFA 15/MAR/01-6, National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). New logo. Designs. Ms. Kohler introduced Bernard Plough from the agency and then showed designs for this logo, one form for general use and another for brochure purposes. The lettering was blue on a white ground, based on the initials of the agency; the brochure version featured the three boron atoms in a bright orange color. Mr. Plough added that a base color other than blue might be used on occasions

when the change seemed appropriate. Ms. Malino was a little disturbed by the orange-colored atoms, thinking they looked like three oranges, but this did not bother the other members, and the design was then unanimously approved. Exhibit E

F. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 01-27, 3700 O Street, N.W. Georgetown University. Ryan Administration Building. MBNA Performing Arts Center addition. Concept. Mr. Martínez said the Old Georgetown Board had reviewed the project three times, made a site inspection, and at its March meeting gave the design concept approval. He read the Board's report and located the site on a map, saying that it was north of Old North and near Healy Hall and the cemetery. He pointed out the old Ryan Administration Building, built originally as a gymnasium in 1906, saying that it would be renovated for use as a small studio theatre, and a larger theatre, built of limestone and brick, would be added, taking advantage of the steep slope behind the Ryan building; loading docks and service space would be placed at the lower level. The old and new structures would be joined by a glass lobby connector. He said the Board had no objections to the design, but had asked for further study of the use of stone on the terrace and for the retaining walls for the exterior steps, and for some other refinements of the architectural elements. Mr. Martínez introduced Lee Allen from the university, who then introduced architect Hugh Hardy from Hardy, Holzman, Pfeiffer Associates

Mr. Hardy commented on the remarkable quality of the site–the views of the roofs and tower of the Healy Building, with its combination of vertical and horizontal elements, and the dramatic quality of the site itself, which had a three-story grade change from the upper to the lower level, making it a perfect site for a theatre. He then talked briefly about possible circulation changes in the area to improve both pedestrian and vehicular traffic and access to the theatre, pointing out that the entrance to the new auditorium would be from the upper level, through the old Ryan Administration Building, which would house a small experimental theatre. Progressing downward, one would pass through the glass connector space to the auditorium; at a still lower level would be various kinds of support spaces–dressing rooms, shops, etc. and finally, the loading dock space. Mr. Hardy showed drawings, noting that these various functions were expressed in independent volumes, put together in a way that would allow them to respond to the contours of the site, rather than lining them all up. Roofs would have a simple gable form; he said attempts to use the hip roof seen on the Ryan Building were not successful. He talked about materials, saying that at first he had used brick as the main material, responding to the Ryan Building, and adding some stone aecents; later, on the advice of the Georgetown Board, he had used more stone than brick, and he thought that had been successful. He said he had not made many direct references to elements seen either in the Ryan Building or others in the area because it was always hard to know where to stop once you started on this path, although he noted that the two-story windows seen in the Ryan building had been used as a theme in the new construction, although not on the same scale.

Turning again to the materials, Mr. Hardy talked in more detail about the stone, which was a limestone from Canada; he showed a sample, noting the rough-hewn texture and the extraordinary patterning. Roofs would be standing-seam metal, painted a grey-green. He said they had not yet made a decision

on the brick. There was no further discussion; the Commission was pleased with the concept design, and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit F

b. Appendix I. Mr. Martínez said there had been no changes to what the members had been sent, but he wanted to call their attention to OG 01-90, 3100 South Street, N.W., the Georgetown Incinerator project. He said the main proposal was to add another floor to what was approved at the last review in June 2000, and the Georgetown Board had approved it, noting also that the redesign brought about a change in location of the setbacks would allow a better view of the smokestack itself. He said he had placed letters in the members' folders from the ANC 2E and the Citizens Association commenting on the project. The Secretary noted that there were people present who would like to speak, and the Acting Chairman called first on Barbara Zartman.

Ms. Zartman said she was representing the Citizens Association of Georgetown, but she recalled that until recently she had chaired the zoning committee for the ANC and had probably seen every presentation of this project since its earliest days; she said she wanted to go on record as saying how much the work of the Georgetown Board and the Commission on this project was appreciated. As for the current proposal, she said the Citizens Association thought it had gone too far; she said the vista down Wisconsin Avenue to the river was a very special one, and was recognized as such on the comprehensive plan by its classification as W1, height limited to no more than 40 feet. She said that as the height of the project was measured from South Street, the highest point on the site, it allowed a height of over 100 feet, including the penthouse, at the corner of Wisconsin Avenue and K Street. The additional level requested would require a height variance, and she asked that the Commission send the design back to the Georgetown Board for further work on setbacks at the corners of the new floor that would minimize the intrusion on the vista. She asked Bill Cochran, former president of CAG, to speak.

Mr. Cochran, an architect, said his office had been in the area of the incinerator project for about twenty years, and he stated that the vista down Wisconsin from the C&O Canal to the river was one of the few important ones in Georgetown. He observed that on the west side, the Dodge Center Building had been set back very dramatically at almost a 45 degree angle to preserve the vista of the Potomac River and Roosevelt Island. If the east side had been developed as an independent site at the corner, it would have been half as high as what was planned with the incinerator project. He said it was a tragic situation, and the Citizens Association wanted to see it rectified. He commented that the Georgetown Board's primary concern seemed to be whether the incinerator could be seen from the waterfront, although, in reality, the Whitehurst Freeway would always block its view there; the only place it could really be seen from was Roosevelt Island. He said the important views to preserve, from the standpoint of community values and urban design, were those down Wisconsin Avenue and perhaps 31st Street to the river. He thought that if the project was going to be allowed extra height, it should be placed out of the view line.

The Secretary asked to add a historical footnote to the discussion. He said the Commission had played a very important role in establishing the special zoning in this area, zoning that was like no other in the city; he said it was considered one of the most important sites in the entire waterfront plan because of the view Mr. Cochran had mentioned. He thought the request to add another floor was something that should be considered very carefully.

Shalom Baranes, architect for the project, asked to speak. He said he could not agree more that the view down Wisconsin Avenue was critical, and he thought they would just have to be very careful. He said they had developed a whole series of massing studies for this corner, and one thing they did not want to do was to develop a ziggurat up the side of the building; he thought it was very important to maintain the street wall and be very careful about the kind of setbacks introduced. He said there would be a setback at the podium, about two and one-half stories above the street, followed by a primarily glass wall, treated as a bay, and then another setback for the top floor. He said they had tried the other kinds of setbacks suggested, but they upset the massing of the entire K Street facade and took the emphasis away from the smokestack.

The Acting Chairman told Mr. Baranes that the Commission had not been in on this debate about adding an extra floor, and she asked the developer, Anthony Lanier, if he would explain the reasons for his request. Mr. Lanier said the bankruptcy filing of the movie chain intending to run the theatres had stripped a major economic component from the project , and they had the choice of stopping the project because they could not complete their financing without this component, or complete it as originally intended and add another floor of residential space to make up for the lost revenue. Mr. Baranes said the space had really been designed for movie theatres, and it was not the kind of space easily adaptable to other uses The Acting Chairman asked the Secretary if there was any precedent for changing the 40-foot limit, and he said that there was none that he knew of; in every case he could think of east of this site the Commission had pressed for and gotten heights that were a few feet shorter than the limit. Ms. Malino said she was worried that if the Commission approved the addition of another floor for an economic dilemma that was beyond its purview, it would establish a bad precedent. Mr. Baranes thought the Commission did not operate so much by precedent as it did by reviewing projects on a case-by-case basis.

Richard Nettler, lawyer for the developers, asked to comment. He said this site was different from others in that there were several historic buildings on the site which had to be kept, and this had cut down on the full development of the site to subsidize the theatres. Because of this difference he did not think the allowance of extra height would set a precedent.

Mrs. Brody said she thought Mr. Baranes could handle the extra height well from an architectural viewpoint, but she thought she was in the minority. The important thing to her was that the Commission really had not received enough information or had enough time to think about the ramifications of this request, and she thought that before they disagreed with the Georgetown Board, they should send the submission back to them and ask them to take another look in light of the controversy and new information. The Secretary agreed, saying that he didn't think the Board members really knew the background of the 40-foot limit, and if they had, they might have come to a different conclusion.

There was further discussion, and a motion was made and seconded that Mr. Baranes and Mr. Lanier return after the Georgetown Board had had a chance to review the project again in light of the testimony given at this meeting and Mr. Atherton's information. Mrs. Brody thought it important that the project be sent back to the Board with a balanced viewpoint and not a negative view, noting that there was no vote taken and that it was being returned more out of respect for the process than for any resolution on the part of the Commission members. The motion was unanimously carried.

The remainder of the Georgetown Appendix was then unanimously approved.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 01-024, Massachusetts Avenue and H Street, N.W. (Square 529). Massachusetts Courts. New fourteen story apartment building. Revised concept. Mr. Lindstrom recalled the previous month's submission, when the Commission had several questions regarding zoning and plans for the north of Massachusetts area (NOMA) and had asked the staff to contact the District's Office of Planning. Mr. Lindstrom said he had done that and was told they had no specific proposals, but at this point were encouraging mixed-use with housing of moderate density for the north side of the avenue. He commented that this was not much help in determining what might be opposite the proposed apartment building.

Mr. Lindstrom then introduced John Sunter of Clark Realty and architect Sami Kirkdil from SKG to present the revisions that had been made to the design in response to the Commission's suggestions and those of the Historic Preservation Review Board Mr. Sunter began by saying that everyone involved had expressed a concern for street life–how the building would meet the street and what activities there would be at the street level. He said the first thing they did was to move the loading and parking entrances away from the street and place them in the alley, making the street front safer for pedestrians. The next thing was to remove the English basement apartments, raise the floor level, and put retail along the street front. Since the building was already at its height limit, this meant that one floor of housing had to be eliminated–he said that would be discussed later. Mr. Sunter then asked Mr. Kirkdil to talk about the architectural changes.

Mr. Kirkdil said the architectural changes were made to remove the megastructure look and give the building the appearance of several structures built over time. He noted that one floor had been taken off the 3rd Street side, the setback increased, and a cornice line placed at about 83 feet to lower the mass and be more sympathetic to the historic buildings at the H Street corner. On the H Street facade, there would be a heavier brick base, belt courses, stronger cornices at the second and third floor levels, and traditional store fronts with canopies and balconies to break up the mass. Metal spandrel panels on the curved tower element and on the upper levels of the H and 3rd Street facades would offer further variety. Mr. Kirkdil then commented on the separate building on 4th Street, saying that to make up for the FAR lost when one floor was removed from the 3rd Street side, they would add a floor to this building. Mr. Lindstrom said the District's Historic Preservation Review Board had requested the lowered height on 3rd Street in deference to the small historic buildings, and the trade-off was to add a floor to the 4th Street building. Mrs. Free asked how much height would be added and was told it would be ten feet, still keeping the overall height well below the 110-foot limit allowed.

Mrs. Brody asked about the sight-line studies mentioned at the last meeting. Mr. Lindstrom said they would apply not to this building but to two other buildings, yet to be built, which would affect the views along 4th Street, particularly of the National Building Museum; he said the Commission would have jurisdiction over only one of them, but he thought the District's Office of Planning and the HPRB were aware of the potential problems. There were further questions from Mrs. Brody and the Acting Chairman about materials and colors, and they were assured that these would be submitted during the

design development phase. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried that the concept design be approved; details, materials, and colors were to be submitted later. Exhibit F

B. Appendix II. Mr. Lindstrom said there had been one addition to the draft the members had received, and that was for minor fenestration revisions to the National Research Council project at 500 5th Street, N.W. There were no questions , and the Appendix was unanimously approved.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:43 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A

26 March 2001

Dear Mr. Carlstrom:

The Commission appreciated the opportunity to view the mockup of the proposed new lighting scheme for the Jefferson Memorial on the evening of 14 March 2001. As you know, the nighttime illumination of the city's memorials and buildings has been of continuing concern to the Commission. We are greatly supportive of the National Park Service's desire to update and improve the Jefferson Memorial's lighting and are grateful to the private companies donating time and equipment to this important project.

During its meeting of 15 March 2001, the Commission reviewed and discussed its findings of the night before, but did not approve the new lighting design. Although the mockup evenly dispersed the light over the entire front of the memorial, including the steps for the first time, it was determined that it was too bright, especially considering that the memorial was only partially illuminated during this experiment. The desire is to maintain an effective balance between the general luminescence of the city and the highlighted monuments and Capitol building. In particular, the Jefferson Memorial should not appear brighter than the Washington Monument when seen from the White House. As we evaluate this proposal, we are obligated to consider the collective ensemble of all the memorials and surrounding structures that are illuminated. We would like to see a second mockup which might reduce watt intensity from 400 to 250.

To help with this evaluation, we request, for empirical comparison, a study of the reflected luminescence from the memorial's facade. By measuring lumens, the amount of light that is actually reflected from the stone can be determined and compared. Measurements of the existing lighting and the revised proposed scheme should be taken from several locations around the memorial, as well as in bright daylight for a baseline correlation. In addition, for an overall comparison, similar measurements should also be taken at the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and the Capitol Building.

We believe the proposed interior changes, including accent light on the sculpture, up-light on the dome, and highlighting the inscription on the frieze of the entablature, will be an enhancement to the memorial. The one interior item of concern to the members was the highlighting on the text walls. They thought the spotlighting of these areas should be softer, almost imperceptible. To accomplish the desired effect, the level of light on these walls will have to be balanced to account for the exterior light spilling into the chamber. This, we suspect, can only be done once the exterior design is in place.

We look forward to the continued review of the memorial's lighting and ask you to contact the staff to set a time for the second mockup and perhaps arrange visits to the other sites mentioned above. As always, the staff is available for assistance should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Emily Malino
Acting Chairman

Mr. Terry Carlstrom
Regional Director, National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, SW
Washington, D.C. 20242

cc: John Parsons

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

26 March 2001

Dear Mr. Finberg:

During its meeting of 15 March 2001, the Commission reviewed the revised submission for the interim landscaping component of the Department of Education Building's Parking Ramp Safety Railing Installation Project and approved a modified version of one of the schemes submitted. After deliberation, it was decided that the best interim installation, in the borders adjacent to the parking ramps, would feature American Arborvitae (*Thuja occidentalis 'Smaragd'*) with Mondo Grass (*Ophiopogom, O. japonicus*) as the ground cover. The Mondo Grass is suggested because it stays green year round whereas the proposed Liriope turns an unsightly brown during its dormant period in the winter. The Arborvitae selected for this planting should be approximately five to six feet tall, in columnar shape, and placed in front of the building columns to highlight the architecture.

We look forward in the near future to reviewing GSA's proposal for a coordinated new landscape design for the Department of Education Building's plaza and surrounding block. As always, the staff is available for assistance should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Emily Malino
Acting Chairman

Mr. Jack Finberg
Special Assistant for Regional Coordination
U.S. General Services Administration
National Capital Region
301 7th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20407-0002

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

26 March 2001

Dear Lieutenant Colonel Young:

During its meeting 15 March 2001, the Commission reviewed the proposed additions and alterations to Building 83 at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, which will house the technical center presently located in building T-2, scheduled for demolition. The additions are designed in the International Style of the adjacent Building 91 rather than in the character of the older building to which they will be appended.

At this time, the Commission is not able to approve the design as proposed. We recommend that you work with the staff to arrive at an acceptable middle ground that would both relate to the existing building and meet the deadlines on the project.

We regret that the project had not been shown to us at an earlier stage of design. We encourage you to submit all future projects at concept level. It is more effective in the long run and gives us the opportunity to comment with plenty of time for you to respond to our recommendations.

Our next meetings are scheduled for 19 April and 17 May. Please call on the staff when you are ready.

Sincerely,

Emily Malino
Acting Chairman

Lieutenant Colonel Ronald Young
Director, Directorate, Public Works
Department of the Army
Walter Reed Army Medical Center
Washington, DC 20307-5001

cc: Ms. Marjorie Marcus
Mr. Ed Awni

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

26 March 2001

Dear Lieutenant Colonel Ostrom:

During its meeting of 15 March 2001, the Commission reviewed and approved the restoration and renovation of Stables Building #233 in the Fort Myer Historic District, provided, on the east elevation, the door opening and the window above are returned to their original configuration. Both of these openings should be restored with the arched double-row brick headers as shown in the historic photograph labeled Exhibit D in the Historic Report submitted. We request submission of revised drawings reflecting these changes when ready.

The Commission commends the Army for its effort to preserve the rich character of this landmark military base by rehabilitating the historic buildings to their original appearance. We look forward to future submissions by the Fort Myer Military Community Department of Public Works and, as always, the staff is available to assist you and your staff should questions arise.

Sincerely,

Emily Malino
Acting Chairman

Lieutenant Colonel Michael T. Ostrom
Director of Public Works and Logistics
Department of the Army Headquarters
United States Army Garrison, Fort Myer
204 Lee Avenue
Fort Myer, VA 22211-1199

cc: Myrtle Bowen

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT E

26 March 2001

Dear Mr. Matts:

During its meeting on 15 March 2001, the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the National Nuclear Security Administration's new logo. I am happy to tell you they were approved.

Sincerely,

Emily Malino
Acting Chairman

Stephen D. Matts, USN
Executive Staff Director
National Nuclear Security Administration
Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

15 March 2001 EXHIBIT F

OLD GEORGETOWN ACT
AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-27 HPA. 01-63	3700 O Street, NW Georgetown University Ryan Administration Building	Performing Arts Center addition - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to the general concept design for proposed new Performing Arts Center for the Georgetown University campus. Recommend further study of the use of stone on the terrace and retaining walls for the exterior steps. Recommend further refinement of the brick walls and spandrels on window bays. File new submission of the development of the concept design for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 01-90 HPA. 01-190	3100 South Street, NW Millennium Georgetown Partners Georgetown Incinerator The Ritz Carlton	Addition of one residential floor - revised design - conceptual

ACTION: On HOLD until Old Georgetown Board meeting 5 April 2001 and Commission meeting 19 April 2001 for further review with applicant.

---

15 March 2001

EXHIBIT F

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE
AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 01-024	4th and H streets, NW Massachusetts Courts Clark Realty Capital	New 14 story and 7 story apartment buildings. Concept.

ACTION: No objection to concept design for a new 14 story apartment building with ground level retail space on H and 4th streets, and the preservation of 3 historic structures at the corner of H and 3rd streets, and a new 7 story apartment building on 4th Street as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 19 March 2001. File new concept submission for design development, including all elevations, details and materials samples for review by the Commission when ready. (Previous: CFA 15 February 2001)